arXiv:1112.4071v2 [math.PR] 6 Nov 2012

Müntz linear transforms of Brownian motion

Larbi Alili$^{(1)}$ **Ching-Tang Wu**$^{(2)}$

ABSTRACT

We consider a class of linear Volterra transforms of Brownian motion associated to a sequence of Müntz Gaussian spaces and determine explicitly their kernels. We give new explicit examples of progressive enlargement of filtrations and interesting links with Müntz-Legendre polynomials. By exploiting a link to stationarity, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of kernels of infinite order associated to an infinite dimensional Müntz Gaussian space; we also examine when the transformed Brownian motion remains a semimartingale in the filtration of the original process. This completes the partial answers obtained in ([13], [17], [18]) to the latter problem.

Keywords and Phrases: Enlargement of filtrations; Gaussian process; Müntz polynomials; Non-canonical representations, self-reproducing kernels; Volterra representations.

AMS 2000 subject classification: 26G15; 60J65.

1. Introduction

There has been a renewed interest in Müntz spaces which is particularly motivated by topics related to Markov inequalities and approximation theory, see for example ([4]–[6]) and the references therein. In the meanwhile, Volterra transforms with non square integrable kernels, involving some functional spaces, provide interesting examples of non-canonical decompositions of the Brownian filtration. This motivated many studies on the topic, for instance see ([3], [8], [13], [15], [29]). Our aim in this paper is to study the class of Volterra transforms involving Gaussian spaces which are generated from sequences of Müntz polynomials. This gives new explicit examples of progressive enlargement of filtrations and interesting links with Müntz-Legendre polynomials; see ([22]–[25], [33]) for studies on this topic in more general frameworks.

To be more precise, let us fix our mathematical setting. Let $(B_t, t \geq 0)$ be a standard Brownian motion defined on a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and denote by $\{\mathcal{F}_t^B, t \geq 0\}$ the filtration it generates. Linear transforms of the form

$$T(B)_t = \int_0^t \rho(t/s) dB_s, \quad t \geq 0, \tag{1}$$

for some $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$, where

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\rho : [1, \infty) \to \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable function s.t. } \int_0^1 \rho^2(1/v) dv < \infty\},$$

were intensively studied in [25]. In particular, we find in P. 54 therein a variant of Theorem 6.5 of [27] which states the following. $(T(B)_t, t \geq 0)$ is a semimartingale relative to the filtration of B if and only if there exist $c \neq 0$ and $g \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\rho(.) = c + \int_1^{\cdot} \frac{1}{y} g(y) dy$.

Let $f_i(x) := x^{\lambda_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots$, be a sequence of Müntz polynomials where $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots\}$ is a sequence of reals satisfying $\lambda_i > -1/2$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots$. Define the family of Müntz Gaussian spaces specified by

$$G_t(\lambda_1, \cdots \lambda_n; B) = \text{Span} \left\{ \int_0^t s^{\lambda_i} \, dB_s, i = 1, 2, \cdots n \right\} \tag{2}$$

and

$$G_t(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots; B) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} G_t(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n; B) \tag{3}$$

for $t > 0$. Let $H_t(B)$ be the closed linear span of $\{B_s, s \leq t\}$. The Müntz transform of order n, associated to $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n$, is a transform T_n of the form (1) such $(T_n(B_t), t \geq 0)$ is a Brownian motion and the orthogonal decomposition $H_t(B) = H_t(T_n(B)) \oplus$

$G_t(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n; B)$ holds for all $t > 0$. Following ([2],[16]), when $n < \infty$, T_n is a Volterra transform of the form

$$T_n(B)_t = B_t - \int_0^t \int_0^u k_n(u,v)\, dB(v)\, du, \quad t \geq 0. \tag{4}$$

Furthermore, the kernel $k_n(.,.)$ is of the form $k_n(t,s) = t^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{j,n}(s/t)^{\lambda_j}$ where the sequence of reals $a_{1,n}, a_{2,n}, ..., a_{n,n}$ is uniquely determined by the system

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_{i,n}}{\lambda_i + \lambda_j + 1} = 1, \quad j = 1, \cdots, n. \tag{5}$$

The latter system, when $\lambda_i = i$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots$, was first discovered by P. Lévy, see ([28], [30]); this example was further studied in [8]. Solving (5), we realized that the kernels $(k_n(.,.), n = 1, 2, \cdots)$ can be simply expressed in terms of Müntz-Legendre polynomials which allows to simplify the study of their properties. Next, Müntz kernels are homogeneous of degree -1 in the sense that $k_n(\alpha t, \alpha s) = \alpha^{-1} k_n(t,s)$ for $\alpha > 0$. As a consequence, the associated Volterra transforms have a close connection to a class of stationary processes. That is, with $U(f)_t = e^{-t/2} f(e^t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the process $(U \circ T_n(B)_t, t \in \mathbb{R})$ is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process having the moving average representation, m.a.r. for short, $(\int_{-\infty}^t \eta_n(t-r)\, d\beta_r, t \in \mathbb{R})$ where β is a Brownian motion indexed by $\mathbb{R}$ and $\eta_n \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$ has the Fourier transform

$$\hat{\eta}_n(\xi) := \int e^{i\xi x} \eta_n(x) dx = \frac{1}{1/2 - i\xi} \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{\xi - i(\frac{1}{2} + \lambda_j)}{\xi + i(\frac{1}{2} + \lambda_j)}. \tag{6}$$

Applying then the characterization given in [26], a glance at (6) allows to detect an inner factor which implies, as expected, that the latter m.a.r. is not canonical with respect to β. By a Paley-Wiener theorem [9], $\hat{\eta}_n$ lives in the Hardy space H^{2+} of functions H which are analytic on the upper half-plane $\mathbb{C}_+ = \{z \in \mathbb{C}; \Im(z) > 0\}$ such that $\sup_{b>0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |H(\alpha + ib)| d\alpha < \infty$. Due to the characterization of H^{2+}, in terms of products of inner and outer functions, formula (6) gives a clear description of what happens when $n \to \infty$. A natural question is to know whether there exists a transform of the form (1) such that $H_t(B) = H_t(T_n(B)) \oplus G_t(\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \cdots; B)$ for $t > 0$. Partial answers are given in ([13], [17], [18]) where the authors established the existence of such transforms. In particular, for an infinite sequence Λ satisfying either $\sup \lambda_j = +\infty$ or $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < ...$ there exists no such a transform such that $(T(B)_t, t \geq 0)$ is a semimartinagle relative to the filtration of B. We see that a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of transforms with infinite dimensional orthogonal complement is the Müntz-Szasz condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{2\lambda_i + 1}{(2\lambda_i + 1)^2 + 1} < \infty. \tag{7}$$

Furthermore, $(T(B)_t, t \geq 0)$ is a semimartinagle relative to the filtration of B if and only if $\sum_1^\infty (1 + 2\lambda_i) < \infty$.

2. **Müntz Gaussian spaces and transforms**

Throughout this paper, we assume that $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \cdots\}$ is a sequence of distinct real numbers such that

$$\lambda_i > -1/2, \qquad i = 1, 2, \cdots, \tag{8}$$

which ensures that the generalized Müntz polynomials $f_i(x) := x^{\lambda_i}$, for $i = 1, 2, \cdots$, lie in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}_+)$. For $t > 0$, let us introduce

$$M_{n,t} = \mathrm{Span}\{x^{\lambda_1}, x^{\lambda_2}, \cdots, x^{\lambda_n}; x \in (0, t]\} \quad \text{and} \quad M_{\infty,t} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} M_{n,t}. \tag{9}$$

which are called Müntz spaces. An associated orthogonal system, known as Müntz-Legendre polynomials, is specified by $L_1(x) = x^{\lambda_1}$ and L_2, L_3 $\cdots$, described by

$$L_k(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} c_{j,k} x^{\lambda_j}, \quad c_{j,k} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(\lambda_i + \lambda_j + 1)}{\prod_{i=1, i\neq j}^{k}(\lambda_j - \lambda_i)}, \quad k = 2, 3, \cdots, \tag{10}$$

see [5] and [6]; note that we use slightly different notations since we start the sequence Λ with λ_1 instead of λ_0. Recall that $L_k(1) = 1$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots$. The celebrated Müntz-Szasz theorem, see e.g. [5], states that $f_1, f_2, \cdots$ is complete in $L^2((0, 1])$ if and only if condition (7) does not hold. Next, to the linear spaces $M_{n,t}$ and $M_{\infty,t}$

we associate, respectively, the families of Müntz Gaussian spaces defined by (2) and (3). Recall that

$$H_t(B) = \left\{ \int_0^t f(u)\, dB_u : f \in L^2((0,t]) \right\}. \tag{11}$$

It follows that the orthogonal complements of $G_t(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n; B)$ and $G_t(\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \cdots; B)$, in $H_t(B)$, are respectively given by

$$G_t^{\perp}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n; B) = \left\{ \int_0^t f(u)\, dB_u; f \in L^2((0,t]), \int_0^t f(s)p(s)\, ds = 0, p \in M_{n,t} \right\}$$

and

$$G_t^{\perp}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots; B) = \left\{ \int_0^t f(u) dB_u; f \in L^2((0,t]), \int_0^t f(s)p(s) ds = 0, p \in M_{\infty,t} \right\}.$$

One of our aims in this paper is to compute explicitly the kernel of a transform of the form (1) such that $H_t(T_n(B)) = G_t^{\perp}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n; B)$, holds for $t > 0$, and examine what happens as $n \to \infty$. In the following result, we treat the case when n is finite.

Theorem 2.1. *Assuming that $n < \infty$ then the following assertions hold true.*

1) The kernel

$$k_n(t,s) := \begin{cases} t^{-1} K_n(s/t) & \textit{if}\ ; 0 < s \le t < \infty; \\ 0 & \textit{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$K_n(s) = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{j,n} s^{\lambda_j}, \quad a_{j,n} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n (\lambda_i + \lambda_j + 1)}{\prod_{i=1, i\neq j}^n (\lambda_j - \lambda_i)}, \quad j = 1, ..., n, \tag{12}$$

is a Goursat-Volterra kernel of order n. Furthermore, writing T_n for the Goursat-Volterra transform associated to $k_n(.,.)$, the orthogonal complement of $H_t(T_n(B))$ in $H_t(B)$ is $G_t(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n; B)$ for all $t \ge 0$.

2) $(T_n(B)_t, t \ge 0)$ is a semimartingale with respect to the filtration of B.

Proof. 1) $T_n(B)$ is a Brownian motion if and only if $k_n(.,.)$ satisfies the self-reproduction property

$$k_n(t,s) = \int_0^s k_n(t,u) k_n(s,u)\, du, \qquad 0 < s \le t < \infty. \tag{13}$$

The latter is obtained by writing $\mathbb{E}[T_n(B)_t T_n(B)_s] = s \wedge t$, differentiating and rearranging terms. But, if we set $k_n(t,s) = t^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{j,n}(s/t)^{\lambda_j}$, then (13) is equivalent to saying that $(a_{i,n}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, n)$ solves the linear system (5). To study the system, consider the n-degree polynomial

$$p_n(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(x+\lambda_j+1) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i,n} \prod_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n}(x+\lambda_j+1)$$

which, of course, has at most n roots. But $p_n(x) = 0$ is equivalent to $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{a_{i,n}}{x+\lambda_i+1} = 1$. This fact, when combined with $\lim_{x\to\infty} p_n(x)/x^n = 1$, implies that $p_n(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(x-\lambda_j)$. Now, let us choose $m \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ and substitute the latter product formula in the expression of $p_n(x)$. Dividing then both sides by $\prod_{j\neq m}(x+\lambda_j+1)$, rearranging terms and letting $x \to -(\lambda_m+1)$ we obtain the expressions of $a_{1,n}$,$a_{2,n}$, $\cdots$, $a_{n,n}$. Next, $k_n(.,.)$ is a Volterra kernel because it is continuous on $\{(u,v) \in (0,+\infty)\times(0,+\infty) : u > v\}$ and satisfies the following integrability condition which is enough for (4) to be well defined. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \left(\int_0^u k_n^2(u,v)\,dv\right)^{1/2} du &= \int_0^t \left(\int_0^1 k_n^2(u,ur)u\,dr\right)^{1/2} du \\
&= 2\sqrt{t}\left(\int_0^1 K_n^2(r)\,dr\right)^{1/2} \\
&= 2\sqrt{t}K_n^{1/2}(1) < +\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the homogeneity and the self-reproduction properties of $k_n(.,.)$. Finally, we need to identify $H_t(B) \ominus H_t(T_n(B))$ for an arbitrarily $t > 0$. But, this amounts to solving the integral equation

$$f(t) = \int_0^t k_n(t,u)f(u)\,du, \quad t > 0.$$

This is easily seen, by differentiation, to be equivalent to an ordinary linear differential equation of degree n. The functions $s \to s^{\lambda_j}$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$, being n linearly independent solutions, we conclude that $G_t(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n; B)$ is the orthogonal complement of $H_t(T_n(B))$ in $H_t(B)$ as required.

2) By using the homogeneity property of $k_n(.,.)$ and the stochastic Fubini theorem, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
T_n(B)_t &= B_t - \int_0^t \int_0^u k_n(u,v) dB_v du \\
&= \int_0^t \left(1 - \int_v^t k_n(u,v) du\right) dB_v \\
&= \int_0^t \left(1 - \int_1^{t/v} k_n(vr,v) v dr\right) dB_v \\
&= \int_0^t \rho_n(t/v) \, dB_v, \quad t \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\rho_n(x) = 1 - \int_1^x k_n(r,1)\, dr = 1 - \int_1^x K_n(1/r) \frac{dr}{r}.$$

The process $(T_n(B)_t, t \geq 0)$ is a semimartingale relative to the filtration of B since we can write $\rho_n(.) = c_n + \int_1^{.} \frac{1}{y} g_n(y) dy$ where $c_n = 1$ and $g_n(.) = -K_n(1/.) \in \mathcal{M}$ and use the result from ([25], P. 54) which is quoted in the introduction. This completes the proof. $\square$

The covariance matrix

$$(m_t^n)_{ij} = \frac{t^{\lambda_i + \lambda_j + 1}}{\lambda_i + \lambda_j + 1}, \quad i,j = 1,2,\cdots,n,$$

of the Gaussian process $\int_0^t f^*(s) dB_s$, where $f := (f_1, \cdots, f_n)^*$ is the transpose of $(f_1, \cdots, f_n)$, has an inverse matrix which we denote by α_t^n. m_1^n is a Cauchy matrix and an explicit formula for its inverse can be found in ([14], [32]). Note also that the Goursat form of $k_n(.,.)$ given below is given in a semi-explicit form in [16]. Here we propose another method to compute the entries of α_t^n and ϕ.

Proposition 2.1. *The kernel $k_n(.,.)$ of Theorem 2.1 satisfies*

$$k_n(t,s) = \begin{cases} \phi^*(t) \cdot f(s) & \text{if } \; 0 < s \leq t < \infty; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\phi(.) = \alpha(.) \cdot f(.)$, $\phi_i(t) = a_{i,n}t^{-\lambda_i - 1}$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ *and the entries of* α_t^n *are given by* $(\alpha_t^n)_{i,j} = a_{i,n}a_{j,n}(\lambda_i + \lambda_j + 1)^{-1}\, t^{-\lambda_i - \lambda_j - 1}$.

Proof. Assume that $k_n(.,.)$ is of the given Goursat form where $\phi_1, \phi_2, \cdots, \phi_n$ are unknown. By using the self-reproduction property (13) a little algebra gives that $\phi(.) = \alpha(.) \cdot f(.)$. The entries of $\phi(t)$ are identified form the expression of $k_n(.,.)$ given in Theorem 2.1. Next, from [2], we know that $(\alpha_t^n, t > 0)$ is given, in terms of ϕ, by

$$\alpha_t^n = \int_t^\infty \phi(u) \cdot \phi^*(u)\, du + \alpha_\infty, \quad \phi(t) = \alpha_t \cdot f(t), \quad 0 < t < \infty.$$

But, here $\alpha_\infty^n \equiv 0$ because $f_1,\ f_2,\ \cdots,\ f_n$ are not square integrable over $(0, +\infty)$. Plugging in the vector ϕ we obtain the matrix α_t^n. $\square$

Remark 2.1. In terms of filtration, for $n < \infty$ and $0 < T < \infty$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_T^B = \mathcal{F}_T^{T_n(B)} \otimes \sigma\left(G_T(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n; B)\right).$$

In fact, $\mathcal{F}_T^{T_n(B)}$ coincides, up to null sets, with $\sigma\{B_u^{(br)}, u \leq T\}$, where $(B_u^{(br)}, u \leq T)$ is the f-generalized bridge over the interval $[0, T]$. A realization of this is given by $B_u^{(br)} = B_u - \psi_T^*(u) \cdot \int_0^T f(s) dB_s$ where $\psi_T(u) = \alpha_T^n \cdot \int_0^u f(r)dr$, for $u < T$. This is called a generalized bridge because $\int_0^T f(s) dB_s^{(br)} = 0$. Note that $T_n(B^{(br)}) = T_n(B)$ on $(0, T)$; see [1] for more details on these processes.

The objective of the next proposition is to show that we can express $K_n(.)$ in terms of Müntz-Legendre polynomials, given in (10), which form an orthogonal basis of $M_{n,1}$. An integro-difference equation is discovered in [8] for the kernels $\rho_n(.,.)$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, for the example where $\lambda_i = i$; assertion 2) of the following result proves to be useful for finding the analogue of Chiu's result for the kernels $k_n(.,.)$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, in the Müntz framework.

Proposition 2.2. *The following assertions hold true.*

1) We have $K_n(x) = \sum_{j=1}^n (1 + 2\lambda_j) L_j(x)$. *In particular,* $K_n(1) = \sum_{j=1}^n (1 + 2\lambda_j)$. *Consequently, we have* $K_n(x) = x^{-\lambda_n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(x^{\lambda_n + 1} L_n(x)\right)$ *or, equivalently,* $L_n(x) =$

$x^{-\lambda_n-1}\int_0^x s^{\lambda_n}K_n(s)ds$. Note that unlike Müntz-Legendre polynomials, the Müntz polynomial $K_n(.)$ does not depend on the order of $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_n$.

2) The sequence $K_n(.)$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, satisfies the integro-difference equation $K_n(x) = K_{n-1}(x) + (2\lambda_n + 1)x^{\lambda_n}(1 - \int_x^1 u^{-\lambda_n-1}K_{n-1}(u)du)$.

Proof. 1) We have $(1 + 2\lambda_n)c_{n,n} = a_{n,n}$ and $(1 + 2\lambda_n)c_{j,n} = a_{j,n} - a_{j,n-1}$. Thus, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} K_n(x) - K_{n-1}(x) &= a_{n,n}x^{\lambda_n} + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}(a_{j,n} - a_{j,n-1})x^{\lambda_j} \\ &= (1 + 2\lambda_n)c_{n,n}x^{\lambda_n} + (1 + 2\lambda_n)\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} c_{j,n}x^{\lambda_j} \\ &= (1 + 2\lambda_n)L_n(x). \end{aligned}$$

Iterating, with the convention that $K_0(.) \equiv 0$, and summing up the equations we get the first formula; $K_n(1)$ is obtained by setting $x = 1$ an using $L_j(1) = 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. As a by-product formula, we note that $(\lambda_j + \lambda_n + 1)c_{j,n} = a_{j,n}$ for $j \leq n$. The second assertion is easily obtained by integration.

2) We quote, from [6], the recurrence formula

$$x^{\lambda_n+\lambda_{n-1}+1}\left(x^{-\lambda_n}L_n(x)\right)' = \left(x^{\lambda_{n-1}+1}L_{n-1}(x)\right)'.$$

Combining this with the first assertion and simplifying yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left(x^{-\lambda_n}L_n(x)\right)' &= x^{-\lambda_n-1}K_n(x) - (2\lambda_n + 1)x^{-2\lambda_n-2}\int_0^x s^{\lambda_n}K_n(s)\,ds. \\ &= x^{-\lambda_n-1}K_{n-1}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating, we find $-\lambda_n K_n(x) + xK_n'(x) = (\lambda_n + 1)K_{n-1} + xK_{n-1}'$. This is nothing but a differential form of the integro-difference equation. It remains to use 1) on the form $K_n(x) = K_{n-1}(x) + (1 + 2\lambda_n)L_n(x)$ and the fact that $L_n(1) = 1$ to conclude. □

Our aim now is to outline a connection between self-reproducing kernels and the classical kernel systems.

Proposition 2.3. *For each fixed* $t > 0$*, the kernel system associated to* $M_{n,t}$ *is given by* $g_{n,t}(u,v) = \frac{1}{t}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1+2\lambda_i)L_i(\frac{u}{t})L_i(\frac{v}{t})$ *for* $0 < u, v \le t$*. Letting* $u \to t$ *we get that* $k_n(t,s) = g_{n,t}(t,s) = \frac{1}{t}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1+2\lambda_i)L_i(\frac{s}{t})$ *for* $0 < s \le t < \infty$*.*

Proof. The kernel system is given by $g_{n,t}(u,v) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} q_{k,t}^{n}(u)q_{k,t}^{n}(v)$ where $(q_{k,t}^{n}(.), n = 1, \cdots, n)$ is an orthonormal sequence that generates $M_{n,t}$. This is a reproducing kernel in the sense that, for any $Q_t \in M_{n,t}$, we have $Q_t(u) = \int_0^t g_{n,t}(u,v)Q_t(v)\,dv$. Exploiting homogeneity, we easily check that the sequence $(q_{j,t}^{n}(x), x \in [0,t]; j = 1, 2, \cdots, n)$ defined by $q_{m,t}^{n}(u) := \sum_{k=1}^{m} c_{k,m}(t)u^{\lambda_k} = \sqrt{(1+2\lambda_m)/t}L_m(u/t)$ satisfies the requirements. We conclude using continuity and the fact that $L_n(1) = 1$. $\square$

In the proof of the following result, we use the well known fact that the set of covariance functions is closed under limits and some classical techniques from the mean squared calculus, see for example [31].

Proposition 2.4. *For* $n < \infty$ *the kernel* $\Gamma_n(s,t) = k_n(t \vee s, t \wedge s)$*, on* $(0,1] \times (0,1]$*, is positive definite. Furthermore, as* $n \to \infty$*, the following assertions are equivalent*

(i) $X_n(.) := \int_0^{.} k_n(., r)dB_r$ *converges in* $\mathcal{L}^2$ *and a.s..*

(ii) $\Gamma_n(.,.)$ *converges to a positive definite function* $\Gamma(.,.)$ *on* $(0,1] \times (0,1]$*;*

(iii) $K_n(.)$ *converges pointwise to* $K(.) \in L^2((0,1])$*;*

(iv) $\sum_1^n(1+2\lambda_i)$ *converges.*

Proof. By using the self-reproduction property (13), we see that $\Gamma_n(.,.)$ is the covariance function of the Gaussian process $(X_n(t), t \ge 0)$ which gives the first statement.

Let us show that (i)$\Leftrightarrow$ (iv). Using the first assertion of Proposition 2.2, we can write $X_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\xi_i$, where $\xi_i = (1/t)(1+2\lambda_i)\int_0^t L_i(s/t)dB_s$. By the orthogonality property of $L_1, L_2, \cdots$, we conclude that $\xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots$ is a sequence of independent Gaussian variables with zero mean and $\mathrm{Var}(X_i) = (1+2\lambda_i)/t$, because $\int_0^1 L_i^2(r)dr = 1/(1+2\lambda_i)$, for $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Since $(X_n(t), n = 1, 2\cdots)$ is an $\mathcal{L}^2$-martingale with orthogonal increments, the martingale convergence theorem gives the equivalence. (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii) is classical from the mean square calculus, see e.g. ([31], P. 135). That is, we use

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[X_n(t)X_n(s)-X(t)X(s)\right] &= E[(X_n(t)-X(t))(X_n(s)-X(s))] \\ &+ E[(X_n(t)-X(t))X(s)]+E[(X_n(s)-X(s))X(t)]. \end{aligned}$$

Using Hölder inequality, we can get all these terms tend to zero. (ii)$\Rightarrow$ (iv) is seen from the convergence of $\Gamma_n(t,t)=\frac{1}{t}\sum_1^n(1+\lambda_i)$. Now, (ii)$\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) is obtained from the expression of $\Gamma_n(.,.)$ and the fact that $K_n(.)$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2((0,1])$ if and only if $\Gamma(t,t)$ converges for some, and hence for all, $0<t\leq 1$. The proof is now complete. $\square$

Remark 2.2. Using the first assertion of Proposition 2.4, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies that $|K_n(r)|\leq\sum_1^n(1+2\lambda_i)/\sqrt{r}$ which remains bounded, under condition (iv), as long as $r>0$. It would be interesting to see whether the derivative of $K_n(r)$ remain as well uniformly bounded for $r>0$; this proves to be useful in the proof of Theorem 3.1 which is given below. If that is the case then Arzelà-Ascoli theorem would imply that the convergence of $K_n(.)$, under condition (iv), is uniform on $(\varepsilon,1)$ for any $\varepsilon>0$. Thus, it is not clear how to approach directly the problem of convergence of Volterra transforms as $n\to\infty$.

3. Connection to stationary Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes

We discuss here a question tackled in [18] which consists on determining a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of an infinite dimensional kernel associated to Λ. Let us recall some excerpts from [25] and [27] on linear transforms of Brownian motions and stationarity. For that, we define

$$S(\beta)_t=\int_{-\infty}^t\eta(t-s)d\beta_s,\quad t\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{14}$$

for some $\eta\in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$, where β is a Brownian motion indexed by $\mathbb{R}$. Assume that β is characterized in terms of B by $\int_0^\infty\varphi(s)dB_s=\int_{\mathbb{R}}V\varphi(r)d\beta_r$ for $\varphi\in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$ where V is the isometry which maps $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ which is defined by $V\varphi(r)=e^{r/2}\varphi(e^r)$. We clearly have $S(\beta)=U\circ T(B)$ where $U\phi(r)=e^{-r/2}\phi(e^r)$ and $\eta(.)=U\rho(.)$.

We set $\overline{T}_n = U \circ T_n$. Because $T_n(B)$ is a Brownian motion, $\overline{T}_n(B)$ is a stationary Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. The focus in the next result is on the m.a.r. of the latter when $n < \infty$.

Proposition 3.1. *For $n < \infty$, the process $(\overline{T}_n(B)_t, t \in \mathbb{R})$ has the m.a.r. (14) where β is the Brownian motion satisfying $d\beta_t = e^{-t/2} dB(e^t)$ and $\eta := \eta_n$ has Fourier transform*

$$\hat{\eta}_n(\xi) = \frac{1}{1/2 - i\xi} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\xi - i(\frac{1}{2} + \lambda_j)}{\xi + i(\frac{1}{2} + \lambda_j)}. \tag{15}$$

Proof. From the last part of the proof of Theorem 2.1 we have $T_n(B)_t = \int_0^t \rho_n(t/v)\, dB_v$, for $t \geq 0$, where $\rho_n(x) = 1 - \int_1^x k_n(r,1)dr$. Thus, with $\eta_n(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\{t>0\}} U \circ \rho_n(t)$, (14) holds with $\eta = \eta_n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\eta}_n(\xi) &= \int_0^\infty e^{i\xi t} e^{-t/2} \rho_n(e^t) dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-(1/2 - i\xi)t} \left(1 - \int_1^{e^t} K_n(1/r)(1/r)dr\right) dt \\
&= (1/2 - i\xi)^{-1} - \int_1^\infty \left(\int_{\ln r}^\infty e^{-(1/2-i\xi)t} dt\right) k_n(1/r)(1/r)dr \\
&= \frac{1}{1/2 - i\xi}\left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{a_{j,n}}{\lambda_j + 1/2 - i\xi}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Fubini theorem for the third equality and the fact that $1 + 2\lambda_j > 0$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots$, for the last equality. The last term is now evaluated by using the obvious decomposition

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{x - \lambda_j}{x + \lambda_j + 1} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{a_{j,n}}{x + \lambda_j + 1}, \quad x \neq -\lambda_j - 1, \quad j = 1, 2, \cdots, n.$$

Note that the latter decomposition allows as well to resolve the system (5). $\square$

Recall that $\eta \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$ if and only if $\hat{\eta} \in H^2_+$ where $\hat{\eta}$ be the Fourier transform of η. It is known that $\hat{\eta} \in H^2_+$ has a unique, up to some multiplicative constant of modulus 1, decomposition of the form $\hat{\eta}(\xi) = cI(\xi)O(\xi)$ where c is a constant, O

and $I = \Pi G$ are, respectively, the outer and the inner parts. The latter are further specified by

$$\begin{aligned} O(\xi) &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{i\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{\xi\alpha+1}{\alpha-\xi}\log|\hat{h}|(\alpha)\frac{d\alpha}{1+\alpha^2}\right) \\ G(\xi) &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{i\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{\xi\alpha+1}{\alpha-\xi}dF(\alpha)+ih\xi\right) \\ \Pi(\xi) &= \prod_{i\in\mathbb{D}}\varepsilon_i\frac{a_i-\xi}{\overline{a}_i-\xi} \end{aligned}$$

where $h \geq 0$, $\varepsilon_i = 1$ if $|a_i| \leq 1$ and $\varepsilon_i = |a_i|/a_i$ and F is a nondecreasing singular function subject to $\int(u^2+1)^{-1}dF(u) < \infty$.

Theorem 3.1. *There exists a transform T_∞ of the form (1) associated to Λ such $H_t(B) = H_t(T_\infty(B)) \oplus G_t(\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \cdots, ; B)$, for all $t > 0$, if and only if (7) holds. Furthermore, $(T_\infty(B)_t, t \geq 0)$ is a semimartingale relative to the filtration of B if and only if $\sum_1^\infty(1+2\lambda_i) < \infty$ holds.*

Proof. Condition (7) is necessary. Otherwise, $f_1, f_2, \cdots$ would be complete in $L^2(0,1)$ which would imply that $H_t(B) = H_t(T_\infty(B))$ for $t \in (0,1)$. Conversely, (7) ensures the convergence of $\hat{\eta}_n$, as $n \to \infty$, to

$$\hat{\eta}_\infty(\xi) = \frac{1}{1/2 - i\xi}\prod_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{\xi - i(\frac{1}{2}+\lambda_j)}{\xi + i(\frac{1}{2}+\lambda_j)},$$

see also Theorem 2 of [17]. Clearly, $\hat{\eta}_\infty \in H^2_+$. This in turn ensures the existence of η_∞ and $\overline{T}_\infty$. The spectral measure of $(\overline{T}_\infty(B)_t, t \in \mathbb{R})$ is

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}|\hat{\eta}_\infty(\xi)|^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{1}{\frac{1}{4}+\xi^2}$$

which is the same as that of a stationary Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. We conclude that $(\overline{T}_\infty(B)_t, t \in \mathbb{R})$ is a stationary Ornstein-Uhlenbelck process; see also Lemma 1 in ([25], P.55). For the semimartingale property, assume first that $\lambda_i \to \infty$ and let us quote an argument, from [13] and [18], to show that $\int_1^\infty \rho'(u)^2du = +\infty$. We have $\int_0^t u^{\lambda_i}\rho(t/s) = 0$ which is equivalent to $\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{u^{\lambda_i+2}}\rho(u)du = 0$. Integrating by parts yields $\int_1^\infty \frac{1}{u^{\lambda_i+1}}\rho'(u)du = -\rho(1) = -1$. By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we get

$(1+2\lambda_i)|\rho(1)|^2 \leq \int_1^\infty \rho'(u)^2du$. This gives that $\int_1^\infty \rho'(u)^2du = \int_0^1 \rho'(1/v)^2\frac{dv}{v^2} = \infty$. Suppose now that $\sum_1^\infty(1+2\lambda_i) < \infty$. By proposition 2.4, $K_n(.)$ converges pointwise to $K(.)$. Using the dominated convergence theorem and Remark 2.2, we see that ρ_n converges to ρ say and ρ takes the form $\rho(.) = 1 - \int_1^{\cdot} \frac{1}{y}K(1/y)dy$. Furthermore, $K(1/.) \in \mathcal{M}$ because $K \in L^2(0,1)$ since it is the limit of functions which are in $L^2(0,1)$. We conclude using the result on Gaussian semimartingales of the form (1) quoted in the introduction. $\square$

Definition 3.1. A Müntz transform is a transform of the form (1) such that, for some $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$, the orthogonal decomposition $H_t(B) = H_t(T_n(B)) \oplus G_t(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n; B)$, for some sequence of reals $-1/2 < \lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n$, holds for all $t > 0$. We call n the order of the transform. The corresponding kernel ($k_n(.,.)$ or $\rho_n(.,.)$) is called a Müntz kernel of order n.

Remark 3.1. As a by-product of the discussion for the order to be infinite we mention the following result. Let φ be a $C^\infty([0,1])$ function satisfying $|\varphi^{(m)}| \leq$ constant, for all m. Then φ is a solution to the integral equation $\varphi(u) = \int_0^1 \varphi(uv)\varphi(v)dv$, defined on $[0,1]$, if and only if $\varphi(.) = k_n(1,.) = K_n(.)$ where $\lambda_j = j$ for $j \geq 0$ and n is some finite positive integer.

Remark 3.2. For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$, $k_n(.,.)$ and T_n as above, introduce the notations $T_n^{(0)} = Id$, $T_n^{(1)} = T_n$ and $T_n^{(m)} = T_n^{(m-1)} \circ T_n$, for $m \geq 2$, where $\circ$ stands for the composition rule for the iterated transforms. We clearly have for m positive integer

$$\cdots \mathcal{F}_t^{T_n^{(m+1)}(B)} \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_t^{T_n^{(m)}(B)} \subsetneq \cdots \mathcal{F}_t^{T_n}(B) \subsetneq \mathcal{F}_t(B).$$

Furthermore, since we are in the homogeneous case, we can show that the decomposition

$$\mathcal{F}_t^B = \bigotimes_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma\left(\int_0^t u^{\lambda_j}\, dT_n^{(k)}(B)_u, 1 \leq j \leq n\right)$$

holds true. Here, by $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}$, for two σ-algebras $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, we mean $\mathcal{F} \vee \mathcal{G}$ with independence between $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$. It follows that Müntz transforms are strongly mixing and ergodic. We also refer to [25] for a proof of this, in a more general framework, which uses the connection to stationarity.

4. EXAMPLE OF INFINITE ORDER TRANSFORMS

Kernels of infinite orders take complicated forms which could sometimes involve special functions. To illustrate that, we shall now give a family of examples.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $r > 1$ be a positive integer. Then the kernel defined by*

$$k_\infty(t,s) = \frac{1}{t}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{r}{k^{r+1}} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k!} \prod_{j=1}^{2r-1} \Gamma(-k\omega_r^j)^{(-1)^j} (s/t)^{j^{-r}}, \quad s \le t,$$

and $k_\infty(t,s) = 0$ if $s > t$, where $\omega_r = \exp(\pi i/r)$, is a Müntz kernel of infinite order with Λ given by $\lambda_i = (r^{-i} - 1)/2$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots$. Furthermore, the m.a.r. of Theorem 3.1, with

$$\hat{\eta}_n(\xi) = -(1-2i\xi)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2r} \Gamma((i\xi)^{1/r}\omega_r^j)^{(-1)^j}, \tag{16}$$

holds true.

Proof. An infinite order Müntz transform associate to Λ exists if and only if $\sum_1^\infty (1+2\lambda_i) = \sum_1^\infty i^{-r}$ converges; this happens if and only if $r > 1$. The following two formula, quoted from ([4], pp. 6-7), simplify the expression of the kernel. First, we have

$$\prod_{j=1, j\neq k} \frac{j^r - k^r}{j^r + k^r} = (-1)^{k+1} \frac{2k(k!)}{r} \prod_{j=1}^{2r-1} \Gamma(-k\omega^j)^{-(-1)^j} \tag{17}$$

where $\omega = \exp(\pi i/r)$. Second, we have

$$\prod_{j\ge 1} \frac{j^r - z^r}{j^r + z^r} = -\prod_{j=1}^{2r} \Gamma(-z\omega_r^j)^{-(-1)^j} \tag{18}$$

Thus, using (17), we can write

$$a_{k,n} = \frac{2}{k^r} \prod_{j=1, j\neq k}^{n} \frac{j^r + k^r}{j^r - k^r} \to \frac{2}{k^r} \left\{ (-1)^{k+1} \frac{2k(k!)}{r} \prod_{j=1}^{2r-1} \Gamma(-k\omega_r^j)^{-(-1)^j} \right\}^{-1}$$

as $n \to \infty$. We have

$$\hat{\eta}_\infty(\xi) = \frac{1}{1/2 - i\xi} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k^r + i/\xi}{k^r - i/\xi}$$

which can be evaluated using (18) to get (16) as desired. □

Acknowledgment: The authors thank Y. Hibino for pointing out a mistake in a previous version of Theorem 3.1. The second author is greatly indebted to the National Science Council Taiwan for the research grant NSC 94-2115-M-009-019-. The first author is indebted to l'Agence Nationale de la Recherche for the research grant ANR-09-Blan-0084-01.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Alili (2002) Canonical decomposition of certain generalized Brownian bridges. *Electron. Comm. Probab.*, **7**, electronic, pp. 27–36.

[2] L. Alili, C-T Wu (2009) Further results on some singular linear stochastic differential equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **119**, no. 4, pp. 1386–1399.

[3] F. Baudoin (2002) Conditioned stochastic differential equations: Theory, Examples and Application to Finance. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **100**, pp. 109–145.

[4] J.M. Borwein, D.H. Bailey, R. Girgensohn (2004) *Experimentation in mathematics: Computational paths to discovery.* A K Peters, Ltd., Natick, MA.

[5] P. Borwein, T. Erdélyi (1995) *Polynomials and polynomial inequalities.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **161**, Springer-Verlag, New York.

[6] P. Borwein, T. Erdélyi, J. Zhang (1994) Müntz systems and orthogonal Müntz-Legendre polynomials *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc*, **342**, no.2, pp. 523–542.

[7] M. Chaleyat-Maurel, Th. Jeulin (1983) Grossissement gaussien de la filtration brownienne. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, **196**, no 15, pp. 699–702.

[8] Y. Chiu (1995) From an example of Lévy 's. *Séminaire de Probabilités*, XXIX, Lecture notes in Math., **1613**, Springer, Berlin, pp. 162–165.

[9] H. Dym, H.P. McKean (1976) *Gaussian processes, Fluctuation theory and the inverse spectral problem.* Academic Press.

[10] H. Föllmer, C.-T. Wu, M. Yor (2000) On weak Brownian motions of arbitrary order. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, **36**, no. 4, pp. 447–487.

[11] M. Erraoui, E.H. Essaky (2009) *Canonical representation for Gaussian processes.* Séminaire de probabilités, XLII, Lecture Notes in Math., 1979, Springer, Berlin, pp. 365–381.

[12] M. Erraoui, Y. Ouknine (2008) *Noncanonical representation with an infinite-dimensional orthogonal complement.* Statist. Probab. Lett., **78**, no. 10, pp. 1200–1205.

[13] M. Erraoui, Y. Ouknine Ouknine (2008) *Equivalence of Volterra processes: degenerate case.* Statist. Probab. Lett.,**78**, no. 4, pp. 435–444.

[14] I. Gohberg, I. Koltracht (1996) Triangular factors of Cauchy and Vandermonde matrices. *Integr. Equat. Oper. Th.*, **26**, pp. 46–59.

[15] Y. Hibino (1996) Construction of noncanonical representations of Gaussian process. *J. of the Fac. of Lib. Arts*, Saga University, no. 28, pp. 1-7. English transl. available at http://www.ms.saga-u.ac.jp/∼hibino/paper.htm.

[16] Y. Hibino, M. Hitsuda, H. Muraoka (1997) Construction of noncanonical representations of a Brownian motion. *Hiroshima Math. J.*, **27**, no. 3, pp. 439–448.

[17] Y. Hibino, M. Hitsuda, H. Muraoka (2000) Remarks on a noncanonical representation for a stationary Gaussian process. *Acta Appl. Math.*, **63**, no. 1-3, pp. 137–139.

[18] Y. Hibino, M., H. Muraoka (2004) Volterra representations of Gaussian processes with an infinite-dimensional orthogonal complement. *Quantum Probability and Infinite Dimensional Analysis. From Foundations to Applications, Eds. M. Shrmann and U. Franz, QP-PQ: Quantum Probability and White Noise Analysis*, **18**, World Scientific, pp. 293–302.

[19] T. Hida (1960) Canonical representations of Gaussian processes and their applications. *Mem. Coll. Sci. Univ. Kyoto Ser. A. Math.*, **33**, pp. 109–155.

[20] T. Hida, M. Hitsuda (1993) *Gaussian processes.* Translated from the 1976 Japanese original by the authors. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, **120**. American Mathematical Society.

[21] M. Hitsuda (1968) Representations of Gaussian processes equivalent to Wiener process. *Osaka J. Math.*, **5**, pp. 299–312.

[22] Th. Jeulin (1980) *Semi-martingales et grossissement d'une filtration.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **833**, Springer, Berlin.

[23] Th. Jeulin, M. Yor (1985) *Grossissements de filtrations: exemples et applications.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **1118**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[24] Th. Jeulin and M. Yor (1990) Filtration des ponts browniens et équations differentielles linéaires. *Séminaire de Probabilit'es*, XXIV, Lecture Notes in Math., **1426**, Springer, Berlin, pp. 227–265.

[25] Th. Jeulin, M. Yor (1993) Moyennes mobiles et semimartingales. *Séminaire de Probabilités*, XXVII, Lecture Notes in Math., **1557**, Springer, Berlin, pp. 53–77.

[26] K. Karahunen (1950) Über die Struktur statiönarer zufälliger Functionen. *Ark. Mat.*, **1**, pp. 141–160.

[27] F.B. Knight (1992) *Foundations of the predictible process.* In: Oxford studies in Probability, vol. 1, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

[28] P. Lévy (1956) *Processus stochastiques et mouvement brownien.* Gauthier-Villars & Cie, Paris.

[29] P. Lévy (1956) Sur une classe de courbes de l'espace de Hilbert et sur une équation intégrale non linéaire. *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.*, **73**, pp. 121–156.

[30] P. Lévy (1957) Fonctions aléatoires à corrélation linéaires. *Illinoi J. Math.*, **1**, pp. 217–258.

[31] M. Loève (1977) *Probability theory II*, 4th Edition, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg.

[32] S. Schechter (1959) On the inversion of certain matrices. *Math. Tables Aids Comp.*, **13**, pp. 73–77.

[33] M. Yor (1992) *Some aspects of Brownian motion, Part I: some special functionals.* Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser.

(1) Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, CV4 7AL, COVENTRY. L.alili@warwick.ac.uk

(2) Department of Applied Mathematics, National Chaio Tung University, NO. 1001, TA-HSUEH RD, 300 HSINCHU, TAIWAN. ctwu@math.nctu.edu.tw